

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated December 10, 2008, the Applicants have amended claims 1, 12 and 19. Claims 1-20 are in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 11-15 and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Christodoulou et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0102119) in view of Cuzzo (U.S. Patent No. 5,129,049).

The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and contend that all of the elements of the Applicant's newly amended independent claims are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the combination of Christodoulou et al. with Cuzzo.

Specifically, the newly amended independent claims now include determining a transit time a secondary printer takes to receive a portion of the print job and a receive time it takes the secondary printer to return the corresponding raster data to the primary printer and using the transit time and the receive time to determine secondary printers to be used for rasterizing a portion of un-rasterized portions of the print job for subsequent addition to the raster buffer.

In contrast, Christodoulou et al. merely disclose a print manager that distributes a "ripping process between two or more different printers" and then returns "disparately ripped data to a single printer for physical marking of documents with indicia in accordance with the ripped data" (see Abstract and Summary of Christodoulou et al.). Next, Cuzzo simply disclose a method for "assuring that a print mechanism in the printer has a strip of rasterized data waiting to be printed when a previous strip has been printed" (see Abstract of Cuzzo).

Although Cuzzo disclose "determining a total rasterization execution time," when Christodoulou et al. is combined with Cuzzo, the combination of these cited references still unquestionably does **not** disclose, teach, or suggest all of the features of the Applicants' newly amended independent claims. Namely, the combined cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed determining a transit time a secondary printer takes to receive a portion of the print job and determining a receive time it takes the secondary printer to return the corresponding raster data to the primary printer and using the transit time and the receive time to determine secondary printers to be used. Therefore, because the combined references are missing features of the independent claims, the Applicants submit that the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn.

With regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (MPEP § 2143.03). Also, the other references cited by the Examiner also have been considered by the Applicant in requesting allowance of the dependant claims and none have been found to teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly **requests** the Examiner to telephone the Applicants' attorney at **(818) 885-1575**. Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,  
Dated: March 10, 2009  
By  
/Edmond A. DeFrank/  
Edmond A. DeFrank  
Reg. No. 37,814  
Attorney for Applicants  
(818) 885-1575 TEL  
(818) 885-5750 FAX